



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Am. St. Rep. 505. The grounds asserted by the council in the principal case for refusing to call the election were that no sufficient grounds were stated in the petition for causing the removal of the officers. This decision adds to the growing body of recall legislation the principle that courts cannot pass upon the sufficiency of the grounds alleged in asking for a recall. "It is clearly the privilege of the people at the polls, rather than the province of the courts, to pass upon the sufficiency of the grounds stated for the removal of an elected officer by the modern method of a recall election."

PROCESS—EFFECT OF SERVING AN UNSIGNED SUMMONS.—An unsigned summons was served on defendant, but the cover of the summons was properly endorsed by plaintiff's attorney, and attached to it was a copy of the complaint signed by plaintiff's attorney. The original summons was duly signed. Judgment was had against defendant by default. Motion by defendant to vacate the judgment and set aside the service of the summons for the reason that no summons had ever been served was denied. Affirmed, *Harvey v. Chicago & N. W. Ry. Co.* (Wis. 1912) 134 N. W. 839.

In Wisconsin it is provided by statute that the summons shall be subscribed by the plaintiff or his attorney. The court in the principal case said: "Defendant had the right to assume that the copy of the summons served was what it purported to be, a true copy of the original, and, if an unsigned summons is in fact no summons at all, then the court acquired no jurisdiction of the person of the defendant." There is a conflict as to the effect of want of proper signature, some courts holding the process absolutely void; others, voidable only. 32 CYC. 440, 441 and cases there cited. The conflict seems due to different interpretations of the legislative intent, some courts holding the statutes to be mandatory, others holding them to be directory merely. In *Mezchen v. More*, 54 Wis. 214, cited by the court in the principal case, it was held that a printed name at the end of a summons is equally as efficient as when written there. See 20 ENCYL. PL. & PR. 1125. And the court, in that case, said that the only object in requiring the name and address of the party or his attorney is to let the defendant know upon whom and where he can serve his papers in the action. Thus the court in the principal case held that the papers annexed to the summons gave the defendant sufficient notice, and that the omission of the defect was a mere irregularity and not jurisdictional. Minnesota, upon facts similar to those of the principal case, held the omission an irregularity only. *Lee v. Clark*, 53 Minn. 315; Iowa, *Contra: Hoitt v. Skinner*, 99 Iowa 360. Both cases are cited by the court in the principal case.

TRADE UNIONS—PROCURING DISCHARGE—ESTOPPEL.—Plaintiff, a foreman, refused to acquiesce in the demand of the union that all foremen join the union and pay an unfair initiation fee. Thereupon the members of the union struck. Later, at the superintendent's suggestion, the men working under the foreman voted on whether he should be retained or discharged. The foreman was present, and while he did not agree to abide by the result, he made no objection to the taking of the vote, which resulted in favor of his discharge, and in pursuance of which, the superintendent discharged him. *Held*, the strike being unjustifiable, the plaintiff had a right of action against all